Approved For Release 2002/01/03 TTAPPP79M00062A000200010009-2

-6439-73 Copy /

25X1A

MEMORANDUM FOR: General Allen

Lew:

We have received our copy of your "Plan of Action in Response to Recommendations of OMB Staff Study Report" which you have distributed to the Community. I think it is a constructive paper, and I am pleased that the critique prepared by the Agency in December and January was helpful to you in formulating your plan.

25X1D



I do want to express some concern, however, about the one section of your report which differs substantially from our recommendations; namely, the following paragraph from page 4 of your "Plan of Action":

25X1D

"Responsible production group elements in CIA have indicated, in response to the OMB report, that they are reluctant to recommend specific increases at this time in the number of staff analysts devoted to Soviet missile systems. They have concluded that undefined 'substantial increases of analysts devoted to a particular subject area,' such as the SS-9 and ABM, could not be justified because full and productive use could not be guaranteed in light of the sometimes intermittent flow of new data. This point of view, which emphasizes dependence upon short term fluctuations of the flow of new data from sophisticated collectors, seems questionable for at least two reasons. First it implies a short term 'current intelligence' orientation rather than the longer term, in-depth studies which may take several months to complete and which meld data from several sources and from a time frame that may encompass several years of Soviet testing. Second, some of the sophisticated new data sources have greatly expanded the volume of data available for selective analysis."

NANDLE VIA

SECRET

E 2 IMP DET CL SIGNER

Approved For Release 2002/01/03 : CIA_RDP79M00062A000200010009-2

4.18

The fact that this is the only place in the paper which makes attribution to CIA or to any other Agency raises some question about the purpose of the reference; however, I am more concerned about the identification of CIA with an orientation toward "short term current intelligence..." rather than the "longer in-depth studies." I do not know whether you or your staff believe that this is true, but I think the reader of this paragraph will assume that you do and that the CIA response to the OMB Report supports that conclusion. If you will read what we said on page 10 of our critique, I think you will agree that the text provides no basis for such a conclusion. We do not believe we are oriented to short term current intelligence rather than in-depth studies; I hope you do not believe it either and I hope the Community does not get the impression from your paper that we are.

Donald H. Steininger

25X1A